

**LAW REVERSIONARY INTEREST
SOCIETY, LIMITED**

24, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, W.C.

ESTABLISHED 1883.

Capital £400,000
Debentures £180,000

REVERSIONS BOUGHT. LOANS MADE THEREON.
Proposal Forms and full information may be had at the Society's Offices.

W. OSCAR NASH, F.I.A., Actuary.

MIDLAND RAILWAY HOTELS.

LONDON - MIDLAND GRAND - St. Pancras Station, N.W.
(Within Shilling cab fare of Gray's Inn, Inns of Court, Temple Bar, and Law Courts, &c. Buses to all parts every minute. Close to King's Cross Metropolitan Railway Station. The New Venetian Rooms are available for Public and Private Dinners, Arbitration Meetings, &c.)

LIVERPOOL - ADELPHI - Close to Central (Midland) Station.
BRADFORD - MIDLAND - Excellent Restaurant.
LEEDS - QUEEN'S - In Centre of Town.
DERBY - MIDLAND - For Peak of Derbyshire.
MORECAMBE - MIDLAND - Tennis Laws to Seashore. Golf.

Tariffs on Application. WILLIAM TOWLE, Manager Midland Railway Hotels.

X IMPORTANT TO SOLICITORS X
In Drawing LEASES or MORTGAGES of
LICENCED PROPERTY X

To see that the Insurance Covenants include a policy covering the risk of LOSS OR FORFEITURE OF THE LICENSE.

Suitable clauses, settled by Counsel, can be obtained on application to
**THE LICENSES INSURANCE CORPORATION AND
GUARANTEE FUND, LIMITED,**
24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

**LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE
SOCIETY.**

ESTABLISHED OVER HALF A CENTURY.

10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

FREE,
SIMPLE,
PERFECTED THE SYSTEM
of LIFE ASSURANCE.
AND SECURE.

TOTAL ASSETS, £3,000,000. INCOME, £355,000.

The Yearly New Business exceeds ONE MILLION.

Assurances in force, TEN MILLIONS.

TRUSTEES.

The Right Hon. Lord HALSBURY (Lord Chancellor of England).
The Hon. Mr. Justice KEKEWICH.
The Right Hon. Sir JAMES PARKER DEANE, Q.C., D.C.L.
RICHARD PENNINGTON, Esq.
WILLIAM WILLIAMS, Esq.

Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS	705	NEW ORDERS, &c.....	770
THE DISBURSEMENTS QUESTION	707	LEGAL NEWS	771
CRIMINAL CAUSE OR MATTER: JUDICA- TURE ACT, 1873, s. 47.....	708	WINDING UP NOTICES	772
REVIEWS	709	CREDITORS' NOTICES.....	772
CORRESPONDENCE	770	BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.....	773
		PUBLIC GENERAL STATUTES.....	

Cases Reported this Week.

(BEFORE THE VACATION JUDGE.)

- Lipman v. Branch & Sons..... 771
The Trusts of the Will of the late George Harry, seventh Earl of Stamford and Warrington, Re, and Re The Trustees Act, 1893

VOL. XL., No. 47.

The Solicitors' Journal and Reporter.

LONDON, SEPTEMBER 19, 1896.

* * * The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

CURRENT TOPICS.

IT IS UNDERSTOOD that Mr. Justice COLLINS will undertake the hearing of commercial causes during the ensuing Michaelmas Sittings, and that his place on the Northern Circuit will be supplied by another judge.

MR. JUSTICE CHITTY completed his vacation work on Thursday last, when he finished a heavy list of thirty-five cases, in addition to thirty-six applications to make absolute decrees *nisi in divorce cases*. Mr. Justice CAVE now takes up the vacation business, and, as will be seen from the notice which we print elsewhere, he will sit in the Queen's Bench Chambers on Tuesday only in each week, instead of on Tuesday and Thursday.

WE GREATLY regret to announce the death of Mr. ARTHUR JOHN WOOD, late of Hare Court, Temple, at the age of 75. Mr. Wood, who had been over forty years a member of the bar, was chiefly known for his great services in the revision of the statute law. He was joint secretary to the Register of Statutes Commission of 1862, and when the Statute Law Revision Commission was appointed he was made secretary. He edited at least one volume of the Revised Statutes, and his ability and untiring industry were of inestimable service in the great work which was accomplished by the Commission. Mr. Wood was, during many years, an occasional contributor to this journal, giving our readers the benefit of his unrivalled knowledge of statute law, and pointing out, from time to time, defects in the hasty legislation of recent years.

WE PRINT elsewhere a new rule which has been made with reference to payment into court under the Life Assurance Companies (Payment into Court) Act, 1896. The Rules of the Supreme Court, which we printed recently (*ante*, p. 683), and which are meant to regulate the procedure under the Act, require that an assurance company desiring to make a payment into court shall file an affidavit similar to that which is filed upon a payment into court under the Trustee Act. The R. S. C. relating to proceedings under this latter Act are contained in Order 54*b*. From a reference in the rule now printed we gather that the new R. S. C. relating to proceedings under the Life Assurance Companies Act are to be known as Order 54*c*. The new rule is to be reckoned as rule 41*a* of the Supreme Court Funds Rules, 1894, and it continues the analogy between proceedings under the Trustee Act and under the recent Act by requiring a lodgment schedule to be annexed to the affidavit. It also deals with the preservation by the paymaster of notices of claims transmitted by the assurance company after payment into court. The new rule is certified as urgent, and is therefore already in operation.

WHAT HAS been for a long time recognized as a defect in our criminal law has at last been removed by the Larceny Act, 1896. Until this Act was passed, an Englishman might with impunity have carried on in London the business of a receiver of stolen goods, provided he were careful to deal only in goods stolen in foreign countries. This state of things was hardly creditable to our law, and it was full time that a change should be made. The new Act provides that "if any person without lawful excuse receives or has in his possession any property stolen outside the United Kingdom, knowing such property to have been stolen," he shall be guilty of an offence and liable

to punishment not exceeding seven years' penal servitude. "Property stolen" is to include property obtained by any act which, if committed in the United Kingdom, would be an indictable offence, and the receiving is to be a felony or a misdemeanour, according as that act would be a felony or a misdemeanour if it were committed here.

WE STATED in our issue of the 29th ult. that the task of the committee which has been so long engaged on the work of revising the Rules of the Supreme Court has been practically completed, and we expressed a hope that the new rules might come into operation with the new year. We are disposed to think that we may have been misled by our anxiety to know the result of the protracted labours of the committee into taking too sanguine a view, and it is as well that our readers should be prepared for still further delays. The matter is one of so much general importance that it is worth while to consider it a little more in detail. We have on several occasions referred to the serious character of the work which has been occupying the attention of the committee for so long. Indeed it is difficult to imagine a more delicate task than that which they have undertaken. It is nothing less than moulding into shape the whole of the procedure of our courts, getting rid of anachronisms, inconsistencies, and absurdities which exist in the present code, and making improvements in practice which are suggested by official experience or by the light of judicial decisions. That the eminent judges who have undertaken this laborious task will have brought to bear upon it the most laborious and conscientious industry and zeal nobody will doubt, and they have had at their back very able assistance, though the official element might well have been invoked to their councils at an earlier date. In considering, however, the question which immediately concerns us—viz., when the new code is likely to come into operation, it must not be forgotten that the Committee of Revision, however able and however laborious, is after all not the Rule Committee, and that the new rules, when they appear, must be issued under the authority of that body. If it has taken eighteen months or so (we believe that we are not overstating the case) for the committee to complete their labours, it cannot be expected that the result will be accepted by the authority on whom the duty devolves of considering it, without grave and serious deliberation. We cannot suppose that the Rule Committee will deem it consistent with their high position merely to accept *en bloc* the report of their brethren, the revisers. The reforms and changes suggested will, we doubt not, receive the most anxious and careful consideration before the members of the Rule Committee give the weight of their authority to them. If we are right in this view, the task before the Rule Committee is no light one; it is one which may require their serious attention for many weeks.

BUT, be the deliberations of the Rule Committee long or short, protracted or perfunctory, there remains behind a larger force which has still to be reckoned with. As our readers are aware, by virtue of the Rules Publication Act, 1893, before the new rules can come into operation, forty days' notice will have to be given of the proposal to make them, and copies of the proposed rules can then be obtained by any public body interested, when representations or suggestions will have to be considered by the rule-making authority before finally settling the rules. Here, then, will be the opportunity for public professional opinion to make itself heard. The less deliberation the Rule Committee think it necessary to give to the proposed code, the greater the need for the organs through which the profession speaks (the Bar Committee and the Council of the Incorporated Law Society) to use the utmost vigilance in the shape of scrutiny and criticism. There are considerations which may well give pause to the body of judges before they too rashly accept the conclusions of their brethren of the Committee of Revision. After all, the necessity for haste in this matter is not so great that we cannot afford to wait a little longer. Time which is spent in weighing and considering the probable results of suggested changes in existing procedure is not time wasted. The greater the opportunities

which are given for the objections of competent and well instructed critics to receive full consideration, the greater the probability that we shall in the result find ourselves furnished with a thoroughly serviceable code of procedure. If indeed that should prove to be the welcome result, we shall not lament if we have to wait for it until after the Long Vacation of 1897, and we are by no means sure that that would not be a better date for the commencement of the new régime than an earlier period of next year. In this, as in other matters, *Festina lente* should be our motto.

FRANCE refused to surrender TYNAN in 1883 on the ground that his offence was of a political character, and under the protection of the same plea he has lived safely in the United States ever since. The Extradition Act, 1870, provides that "a fugitive criminal shall not be surrendered if the offence in respect of which his surrender is demanded is one of a political character" (section 3 (1)). Article 5, also, of the Extradition Treaty of 1878 between France and Great Britain, contains a similar provision, and we are not aware of any subsequent modification of such provision. The courts of the country asked to surrender a fugitive must, of course, determine whether an offence is, or is not, of a political character. It remains to be seen whether the French Courts will still hold that the Phoenix Park murders come under this description. In two cases within the last few years our own courts have considered the meaning of the words "political character." In *Re Castioni* (39 W. R. 202; 1891, 1 Q. B. 149) the court unanimously adopted Sir JAS. STEPHEN's opinion that the words mean "that fugitive criminals are not to be surrendered for extradition crimes if those crimes were incidental to and formed a part of political disturbances." This was a case in which there actually existed a state of war in a Canton of Switzerland at the time when the offence was committed, and the offence was committed in the course of open fighting. CASTIONI was not surrendered. In *Re Meunier* (42 W. R. 637; 1894, 2 Q. B. 415), however, the circumstances were very different. The prisoner in this case was an Anarchist guilty of an outrage by dynamite. CAVE, J., said: "It appears to me that, in order to constitute an offence of a political character, there must be two or more parties in the State, each seeking to impose the Government of their own choice on the other, and that, if the offence is committed by one side or the other in pursuance of that object, it is a political offence, otherwise not. In the present case there are not two parties in the State, each seeking to impose the Government of their own choice on the other; for the party with whom the accused is identified by the evidence and by his own voluntary statement—namely, the party of Anarchy—is the enemy of all Governments. Their efforts are directed primarily against the general body of citizens." It is to be hoped that the French courts will take the same view of TYNAN's crime as our judges did in *Meunier's case*, and that as we surrendered the Anarchist to France so France will surrender the Fenian to us. It is time that the Governments of all civilized countries recognized that Fenians and Anarchists are of one species, and should refuse to harbour anyone guilty of following their methods on the grounds that his offence is political. If France should consent to surrender TYNAN for some offence committed recently, and not for the crime of 1883, he cannot be tried for the latter offence, since Article 4 of the Treaty provides that "a person surrendered shall not be tried for any crime or offence committed in the other country before the extradition other than the crime for which his surrender has been granted." Again, if the French authorities consider that his recent conduct has amounted to an offence against the law of France and elect to prosecute him therefor, his surrender may be deferred (under the provisions of Article 13) until he has served his punishment for that offence.

IT HAS been suggested that some difficulty may arise with respect to the extradition of TYNAN by reason of his having become a naturalized American citizen. The French authorities will not, it is said, grant at the instance of the British Government the extradition of the subject of a third State. We cannot, of course, tell what view of this question may be taken in France, but it seems from the case of *Reg. v. Ganz* (9 Q. B. D. 93) that

no such impediment would be recognized in this country. GANZ was arrested under an extradition warrant, and committed to prison with a view to his extradition in respect of a crime alleged to have been committed in the Netherlands. A writ of *habeas corpus* was applied for, one of the grounds being that the prisoner was a naturalized subject of the United States, and so not liable to be extradited at the instance of the Government of the Netherlands, but the application was refused both upon general principle and upon the terms of the treaty between this country and the Netherlands. However a man's civil rights may be affected by his domicile, it is perfectly clear, said POLLARD, B., by the law of all nations that every person who is within the jurisdiction of a country where he commits a crime is subject to that jurisdiction, and hence wherever he is found he ought to be brought back to the same jurisdiction. And this view was borne out by the terms of the treaty with the Netherlands made in 1874. By Art. 1 the contracting parties bound themselves to deliver up to each other "reciprocally any persons who, being accused or convicted of the crimes hereinafter specified, committed within the jurisdiction of the requiring party, should be found within the territories of the other party." The generality of the words "any persons" are qualified in Art. 3, by excluding subjects of the Government to which the request is made, but the fact of this exception being specified makes it additionally clear that the persons liable to be extradited are not confined to subjects of the State requiring extradition. The treaty of 1876 between this country and France contains similar provisions. By Art. 1 the contracting parties engage to deliver up to each other those persons who are being proceeded against for a crime committed in the territory of the one party, and who shall be found within the territory of the other party, but Art. 2 excepts native-born or naturalized subjects of either country. As under the Dutch treaty, therefore, there is no ground for excluding the subjects of a third State; they are included under the general provision of Art. 1, and they are not saved by any exception. It is to be noticed, indeed, that the Dutch treaty has a clause expressly including under "subjects" of the contracting parties such foreigners as are "assimilated to subjects," and it was considered in *Ganz's case* that persons who committed a crime within a particular territory were, for all purposes connected with the crime, to be regarded as assimilated to subjects. The treaty with France contains no corresponding provision, and hence *Ganz's case* cannot, perhaps, be treated as conclusive. But even in the absence of this provision the terms of the treaty, taken in conjunction with the general principle above referred to, seem to be quite sufficient to justify TYNAN'S extradition. It should be observed, however, that Sir EDWARD CLARKE in his work on *Extradition* (3rd ed., p. 224) takes a different view, and urges that, whatever be the terms of the treaty between two States, the surrender of the subject of a third State cannot upon any sound principle be justified unless such third State consents or acquiesces.

THE BURGLARY ACT, 1896, a very short Act which has recently become law, allows the crime of burglary henceforth to be tried at quarter sessions. A large number of rather trumpery cases of burglary are tried at the assizes. These are cases in which houses are entered by persons who intend to steal, but who are not armed or guilty of any personal violence. As, however, the offence is committed by night, it amounts technically to burglary. For example, a case was tried lately at assizes in which it was proved that a hungry navvy on the tramp opened the window of the larder of a public-house in the early morning and stole some food and drink. This case was necessarily tried at the assizes. The object of this Act is evidently to relieve the assizes of such trifling cases. Commitment to assizes is, however, still to be the general rule, for the Act provides that "a justice of the peace when committing for trial a person charged with burglary shall, nevertheless, commit him for trial before a court of assize, unless, owing to the absence of any circumstances which make the case a grave or difficult one, he thinks it expedient, in the interests of justice, to commit him for trial before a court of quarter sessions." It might be better if the Act were more definite, and provided that a court of quarter sessions should

have jurisdiction only where the accused was not alleged to have been armed, or to have used violence, or to have been previously convicted of burglary. As the law stands it is practically left to the discretion of the committing justice whether or not the case is a grave or difficult one, and whether the accused shall be sent for trial to assizes or quarter sessions. If he is sent to quarter sessions, and that court differs from the committing magistrate as to the gravity of the case, he may be sentenced to penal servitude for any period up to life. This is a wide power to give to an unprofessional chairman of quarter sessions. As it is notorious that a prisoner probably receives a heavier sentence when tried at quarter sessions than he would have received if he had been tried on the same charge at assizes, the paltry house thief will probably be the last to feel any benefit from this Act.

IN COMMENTING, a few weeks ago, on Sir EDWARD FRY'S remarks as to commissions, we referred to the objection raised by an evening journal to solicitors sharing with stockbrokers the commission on sale of stocks and shares. We print elsewhere a letter from a well-known firm of solicitors condemnatory of the practice, and asking for information as to how far it is prevalent. Our impression is that the practice is very general, and, in spite of our respect for our correspondents' opinion, and the opinion to the like effect of other members of the profession, we confess we are at present unable to see any harm in it. As we said in the observations to which our correspondents refer, the result of the practice is neither to increase the stockbroker's commission at the expense of the client nor to deprive the client of the benefit of such commission. If the solicitor refuses to receive the share of the stockbroker's commission, the client has to pay the full commission. Moreover, as the practice is adopted by all stockbrokers, it has no tendency to induce the solicitor to employ one rather than another. We are, however, quite open to conviction in case it can be shewn that any evil results, or is likely to result, from the practice. There is one point connected with the matter on which we should be glad to have information—namely, whether, in any case actually tried, a solicitor who employed a stockbroker on the footing of sharing commission has been held liable to the client for the stockbroker's default?

THE DISBURSEMENTS QUESTION.

THE result of the discussion which has taken place in our columns on the subject of solicitors' disbursements has been to shew that the profession, both in town and country, are in accord with the views we expressed in our issue of the 8th of August. We said that it was impossible for a solicitor to justify the making of gain out of the duplication of travelling expenses and other disbursements; and, to our great surprise, we immediately received from a member of a firm of country solicitors of high standing a letter combating that view, and stating that it was opposed to "the almost invariable practice of country solicitors." Thereupon we invited information as to the practice, and we have had no reason to complain of an inadequate response to our invitation. We have printed communications from both London and country solicitors, representing all classes of the profession, from the most important firms of country solicitors to less known practitioners. They are unanimous in repudiating with indignation the allegation of our original correspondent as to the practice of country solicitors. Not a single letter has been received by us (save from our original correspondent) in support of such allegation or in favour of the practice alleged.

None of the writers, however, except the esteemed correspondent whose letter we print this week, have noticed that, whether the practice existed or not, it can no longer be continued. In our report of the judgment in *Coak's case* (*ante*, p. 717), taken from the shorthand notes, the following passage occurs: "The final charge . . . is: 'That the respondent, who had occasion to make numerous journeys to London and elsewhere in connection with the bankruptcy and administration, fraudulently charged and obtained payment more than once for the

same journey, and in many cases fraudulently charged and obtained payment more than once for the disbursements in connection with such journeys.' . . . To put it shortly, it means this—that employed by, say, four different clients to transact some business for each of them in London, he charged to each of them a railway fare, that is to say, four railway fares, four other incidental expenses, including hotel bills, in addition to charging to each of them the proper or professional charge for the services which he in fact rendered; and the extraordinary part of this story is that the respondent, when called upon to explain, said that it had always been his practice if he had come up to London for two or three clients on different matters not to give his clients the benefit of his journey expenses, and he admitted these duplicate charges for expenses were wrong and could not be justified. Can it be wondered that the committee upon this statement and upon these admissions arrived at this grave conclusion, that the respondent fraudulently charged and obtained money more than once, and often several times over, for the railway fare and other disbursements in connection with the same journey, and that this part of the charge is proved?"

It will be observed that the language of the Lord Chief Justice is perfectly general, and is expressly pointed at the duplication of charges against different clients. A correspondent, who has excellent means of knowledge on the subject, tells us that in COAK's case the journeys, and disbursements incidental thereto, were duplicated against the same estate or client, as well as against other parties; and that the Statutory Committee did not take into account the duplication against other parties, the charge being confined to the duplications and triplications of expenses against the same estate. Possibly the Lord Chief Justice purposely dwelt on the duplication against several clients; but it would appear that he was hardly correct in stating the grounds on which the Statutory Committee based its decision. The judgment, however, is a specific condemnation of the practice of duplication against several clients.

We regard with great satisfaction the result of the discussion which has taken place. It shews that the profession are thoroughly sound on the question. The sensitiveness of correspondents at the imputation cast on their integrity has indeed been a source of some embarrassment to the editor; their indignation leading them, in some cases, into unparliamentary references to our highly respectable original correspondent. We cannot help thinking that he must have been labouring under a misapprehension, which he will be the first to correct in the future.

CRIMINAL CAUSE OR MATTER: JUDICATURE ACT, 1873, s. 47.

THE CASE OF Seaman v. Burley in the Court of Appeal (*ante*, p. 684), adds another to the long list of decisions as to the interpretation to be given to the words "criminal cause or matter" in section 47 of the Judicature Act, 1873, which enacts that in cases falling within that description no appeal shall lie from any judgment of the High Court.

There are many cases which clearly fall within the words. If the word "criminal" be taken in its primary meaning of "relating to a crime," it is obvious that any decision of the High Court as to whether or not a crime has been committed, or that certain procedure shall be observed upon the trial of a person charged with a crime, is final, and cannot be interfered with by the Court of Appeal. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the Court of Appeal has refused to entertain appeals from decisions of the Queen's Bench Division discharging a rule for a *certiorari* to bring up, for the purpose of quashing it, a summary conviction by justices (*Reg. v. Fletcher*, 2 Q. B. D. 43), or refusing to grant a *certiorari* for the removal of an indictment for murder (*Reg. v. Rudge*, 16 Q. B. D. 459). Even though the decision sought to be impugned does not affect the actual trial of an accused person, and has nothing to do with his guilt or innocence, if it is given in a matter which is clearly criminal, it is well settled that section 47 applies and there is no appeal. It was laid down by Lord ESHER, M.R., in *Ex parte Woodhall* (20 Q. B. D. 835) that "the clause applies to

a decision by way of judicial determination of any question raised in or with regard to proceedings the subject-matter of which is criminal at whatever stage of the proceedings the question arises." That case was one of a refusal by a Divisional Court to grant an order *nisi pro habeas corpus* on behalf of a person who had been committed to prison under the Extradition Act. Amongst other cases in which the right to appeal has been negatived, although neither the commission of a crime was in question nor the mode of trial of the accused, may be mentioned *Reg. v. Steel* (2 Q. B. D. 37), where the question was as to the taxation of the costs of the trial of a criminal libel, and *Reg. v. Justices of the Central Criminal Court* (18 Q. B. D. 314), where the Queen's Bench Division had discharged a rule for a *certiorari* to bring up and quash an order made upon the conviction of a thief for the restitution of the stolen property.

In two cases relating to corrupt or illegal practices at elections it seems at first sight that the Court of Appeal have departed from the wide rule laid down in *Ex parte Woodhall*. *Reg. v. Holt* (7 Q. B. D. 575) was a case in which it was sought to reverse the decision of the Divisional Court discharging a rule for a *mandamus* to election commissioners to grant a certificate to a witness under the Corrupt Practices Act, 1863, which certificate would have the effect of protecting him from criminal proceedings for bribery: in *Ex parte Walkers* (22 Q. B. D. 384) the Divisional Court had refused to make an order under the Municipal Elections Act, 1884, s. 20, exempting a candidate from penalties. In each of these cases an appeal was entertained by the Court of Appeal, but in neither is any reason given, although the point that it was a criminal matter under section 47 of the Judicature Act, 1873, was raised. But it is to be observed that in these cases no criminal proceedings had in fact been taken, and the decisions appealed from related to the protection or exemption of persons from the consequences of their acts, which consequences might take the form of criminal proceedings; the decisions themselves were not made in a criminal matter, for no such matter was in existence. They do not therefore conflict with the rule established by *Ex parte Woodhall*—that an appeal will not lie to the Court of Appeal from any decision in a criminal matter at any stage of the proceedings.

But the more serious difficulty which has often arisen upon the section is whether a particular case is or is not a criminal cause or matter. This difficulty has been most frequently felt in cases in proceedings to recover penalties. In *Mellor v. Denham* (5 Q. B. D. 467) it was held by BRAMWELL, L.J. (BAGGALLAY and THESIGER, L.J.J., concurring), that an appeal would not lie from the decision of the High Court on a case stated by justices as to an information for contravening a bye-law made under the Elementary Education Act, 1870. The matter, said Lord Justice BRAMWELL, "is disobedience to bye-laws which are enforceable as part of the law of the land, and a person guilty of disobedience to them is liable to a penalty. This is sufficient to constitute a criminal matter, and we have no jurisdiction to hear this appeal." This case was followed in *Reg. v. Whitchurch* (7 Q. B. D. 534), where an order of justices under the Public Health Act, 1875, to fill up an ashpit was treated as a criminal matter. BRAMWELL, L.J., there states that he has not a confident opinion about that or the former case; but BAILEY, L.J., in dealing with an attempt to distinguish that case from *Mellor v. Denham*, says: "It is alleged that the power to impose a penalty does not turn the wrongful act into a crime because an alternative remedy is given—namely, an order to abate or prohibiting the recurrence; but I cannot think that an alternative remedy alters the nature of the offence." Similar decisions were given in *Ex parte Schofield* (1891, 2 Q. B. D. 428), also a case of an order for the abatement of a nuisance; *Reg. v. Young* (66 L. T. 16), a case under the Weights and Measures Acts; and *Payne v. Wright* (66 L. T. 148), an appeal from the decision of the High Court on a case stated under the Metropolitan Building Act, 1855.

The principle to be deduced from these cases would seem to be that where disobedience to an Act of Parliament or bye-laws made under statutory powers involves a liability to a penalty inflicted by way of punishment, the matter is criminal, and there is no appeal. *Loughborough Highway Board v. Curzon* (17 Q. B. D. 344) is not a decision to the contrary, for there the

order of justices that a highway was out of repair, and that the highway board was liable to repair it, was not enforceable by fine or imprisonment.

In the recent case of *Seaman v. Burley* (*ante*, p. 684) the appellant had made default in payment of a poor rate, and the justices ordered that a distress warrant should issue, but stated a case for the opinion of the High Court. It was sought to appeal against the decision of the Divisional Court affirming the order of the justices, but the Court of Appeal (Lord ESHER, M.R., and KAY and A. L. SMITH, L.J.J.) held that they had no jurisdiction, on the ground, apparently, that proceedings to enforce payment of a poor rate were proceedings in a criminal cause or matter, inasmuch as they might end in the imprisonment of the defaulter. This decision appears to go beyond the principle of the cases which have been already adverted to, and there does not seem to be any sufficient reason for regarding proceedings to recover a poor rate as a criminal matter within section 47 of the Judicature Act, 1873. It was held in *Re Wetherell* (19 L. J. M. C. 115) that arrears of poor rate due from a bankrupt are a civil debt provable in bankruptcy, and barred by the certificate of discharge; and a similar decision was come to as to a balance of poor rate due from a bankrupt overseer, although payment of such balance is enforceable by distress: *Reg. v. Master* (L. R. 4 Q. B. 285).

There is a tendency to regard all orders of justices as of a criminal nature, but a distinction must be drawn between their criminal and civil jurisdiction. The mere fact that imprisonment may follow disobedience to an order does not make the proceedings criminal; otherwise it would seem to follow that all proceedings for the recovery of a debt would fall within section 47, because the Debtors Act, 1869, would permit of the enforcement of the payment of the debt by imprisonment in certain events. A distinction has been taken in several cases of attachment between attachment to enforce obedience to orders made in civil actions and attachment in respect of criminal matters: see *Reg. v. Bernardo* (23 Q. B. D. 305); *O'Shea v. O'Shea* (15 P. D. 59). And in *Attorney-General v. Bradlaugh* (14 Q. B. D. 667), which was an action for penalties for voting as a member of the House of Commons without taking the oath, it was held that the proceeding was a civil one, and did not fall within section 47. In so holding the present Master of the Rolls (who has been a party to most of the cases relating to section 47) expressed a view as to the scope and effect of that section which seems to have been lost sight of in some of the decisions to which we have referred. He says that when the Judicature Act was passed "there were proceedings by indictments, there were criminal informations filed by the Queen's Coroner or by the Attorney-General, and there were criminal proceedings before magistrates. It seems to me that the Judicature Act recognized these divisions, and intended that those which were clearly criminal proceedings, and were always recognized as criminal proceedings—those which I have enumerated—should not be brought before the Court of Appeal, but that all others should." If this interpretation of the section is to hold good, it is difficult to see how such proceedings as those in *Seaman v. Burley* can be considered to be criminal within the meaning of the Act, even if proceedings for penalties under the Public Health and other similar Acts are to be so considered. The decisions on section 47 cannot be regarded as wholly consistent or satisfactory, and some authoritative definition of what is a criminal cause or matter within that section is eminently desirable.

The following are the arrangements made by the judges of the Queen's Bench Division for transacting the business of that division during the ensuing Michaelmas sittings—viz., The Lord Chief Justice, Pollock, B., Sir Henry Hawkins, and Grantham, Charles, Wright, and Kennedy, JJ., are on the rota to sit in *Banc*; while Cave, Day, Wills, Lawrence, Collins, and Bruce, JJ., are the judges selected to try actions. Mr. Justice Vaughan Williams will take compasses winding-up cases and bankruptcy business during the sittings, but in the event at any time of these cases not being ready he will try actions. Mr. Justice Mathew has been appointed to attend at Judges' Chambers, but, as he will be absent on circuit during the early part of the sittings, his place will be taken by Mr. Justice Day for a time. The above arrangements will, however, have to be modified from time to time as the various assize judges leave town for their respective circuits.

REVIEWS.

COUNTY COURT EQUITY PRACTICE.

THE PRINCIPLES OF EQUITY AND THE EQUITY PRACTICE OF THE COUNTY COURT; FOR THE USE OF PRACTITIONERS IN THE CHANCERY DIVISION OF THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE AND IN THE COUNTY COURT. WITH PRECEDENTS AND FORMS OF PARTICULARS OF CLAIM, NOTICES OF MOTION, AFFIDAVITS, JUDGMENTS, ORDERS, AND OTHER PROCEEDINGS. By ANDREW THOMPSON, B.A., LL.D., Barrister-at-Law, formerly Lecturer and Reader on Equity to the Incorporated Law Society, and afterwards Professor of Equity to the Inns of Court. William Clowes & Sons (Limited).

Primarily this work was intended for use in county court practice, but the principles which it expounds have an operation beyond the county courts, and the bulk of the book appeals equally to the practitioner in the Chancery Division of the High Court. In county courts we apprehend that it will be found of great service. Although there is a value limit of £500, yet the matters which come within the jurisdiction of these courts cover almost the whole ground of equity practice, and every judge and registrar may have as difficult and diverse points to deal with as a judge and registrar of the Chancery Division. But this is only one part of the work of the courts. The officials must have an equally intimate acquaintance with common law, and ordinarily also with bankruptcy and winding up, while frequently there is admiralty work as well. With all this array of matters to be dealt with it is essential that there should be good tools to work with in the shape of practice books, and Dr. Thompson's work admirably supplies this want so far as equity is concerned. In Part I. he deals with the equity jurisdiction and practice of the county court generally. In Part II., which occupies the greater portion of the book, he takes up the principles of equity and the practice of the county court in relation to particular actions and matters. In this Part the practitioner in the High Court—and, indeed, lawyers generally—will find a very full and admirable statement of the law relating to such important matters as administration, the execution of trusts, mortgages, specific performance, and other subjects usually dealt with in the Chancery Division, while at the end of each chapter there are to be found county court precedents of particulars of claim, orders, &c., which will greatly facilitate the conduct of actions and other proceedings on the equity side of the county courts. The idea has been happily conceived and successfully carried into execution, and Dr. Thompson has spared no pains to make both the references to authorities and the precedents complete. The work has obviously involved great labour and research, and we have little doubt that it will speedily be recognized as a standard work.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Coote's Common Form Practice and Tristram's Contentious Practice of the High Court of Justice in granting Probates and Administrations. Twelfth Edition. By THOMAS HUTCHINSON TRISTRAM, Q.C., D.C.L. The Common Form Portion revised by HENRY A. JENNER, Chief Clerk Personal Application Department, Probate Registry, Somerset House. Butterworth & Co.

The Law and Practice of Building and Land Societies, including the Law of Co-operative Building Societies. By the late HENRY F. A. DAVIS, Solicitor. Fourth Edition, re-cast and in great part rewritten by J. E. WALKER, Solicitor. With an appendix containing Forms of Rules; Precedents of Securities; Tables of Compound Interest; The Statutes; Building Society and Treasury Regulations and Forms; Official Memorandum as to Preparation of Yearly Statement and Account, &c., and a full Index. Sweet & Maxwell (Limited).

The Law of Torts. By J. F. CLERK, Barrister-at-Law, and W. H. B. LINDSELL, Barrister-at-Law. Second Edition. By the Authors, assisted by T. HOLLIS WALKER, Barrister-at-Law. Sweet & Maxwell (Limited).

The History of Roman Law. (Translated with the Author's permission.) From the text of Ortolan's *Histoire de la Législation Romaine et Généralisation du Droit.* By ILTUDUS J. PRICHARD, Esq., F.S.S., and DAVID NASMITH, Esq., LL.B., Barristers-at-Law. Second Edition. By JOHN CUTLER, B.A., Barrister-at-Law, Professor of Law at King's College, London. Butterworth & Co.

The Tithe Acts and the Rules under the Tithe Act, 1891; together with the Extraordinary Tithe Redemption Act, 1886, the London (City) Tithes Act, 1879, and other Acts relating to the subject of Tithe and Tithe Rent-Charge. Also Explanatory Notes and References, and an Introduction containing a Short Treatise on the Recovery of Tithe Rent-Charge. Sixth Edition. By GEORGE PEMBERTON LEACH, Barrister-at-Law, Assistant-Commissioner to the Board of Agriculture. Shaw & Sons; Butterworth & Co.

The Agricultural Rates Act, 1896, and the Order of the Local

Government Board made thereunder. With full Explanatory Notes, an Introduction, and an Appendix. Second Edition. By WALTER C. RYDE, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Shaw & Sons; Butterworth & Co.

English Constitutional History from the Teutonic Conquest to the Present Time. By THOMAS PITT TASWELL-LONGMEAD, B.C.L. Oxon. Fifth Edition, revised throughout, with Notes, by PHILIP A. ASHWORTH, Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Haynes.

The Game Laws of England, with an Appendix of the Statutes relating to Game. By G. TAYLOR WARRY, Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Sons (Limited).

The Institutions of Italy. By JOHN P. COLDSTREAM, Writer to Her Majesty's Signet. Arch. Constable & Co.

Trustees in Bankruptcy: their Duties, Powers and Liabilities. By SIDNEY WRIGHT, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Frank P. Wilson, "Estates Gazette" Office.

Hazell's Guide to the Agricultural Rates Act, 1896. Containing a Full Introduction and Explanation; Annotated Text of Act, with the Regulations of the Local Government Board; The Circulars issued by that Board; Tables of Dates, &c. Hazell, Watson, & Viney (Limited).

Journal of the Society of Comparative Legislation. Printed for the Society by Rivington, Percival, & Co.

The Insurance Blue Book and Guide for 1896-1897. Being a Handy Book of Reference, containing a large amount of information useful to Insurance Officials, Brokers, Agents, Bankers, Financiers, and others, and a Public Guide to Safe and Profitable Insurance. Champness & Co.

American Law Review. July-August, 1896. Editors, SEYMOUR D. THOMPSON (St. Louis); LEONARD A. JONES (Boston). Reeves & Turner.

The Law Magazine and Review for August, 1896. Stevens & Haynes.

CORRESPONDENCE.

EXEMPTION UNDER SECTION 21 (5) OF THE FINANCE ACT, 1894.

[To the Editor of the *Solicitors' Journal*.]

Sir,—The Finance Act of 1894 treated with almost unsparing severity property which returns to the disposer himself, and that merely under his own disposition, upon a death after the commencement of the Act.

The apparent iniquity of this is somewhat redressed in cases arising since the commencement of the Act of this year. It has been recognized, indeed, that it is too harsh, and outside the line of any proper death duty, to tax as if it were derived from another that which is one's own, and which, having temporarily alienated and as it were lent for a time, he has received back under his own disposition.

It might, therefore, be expected that such claims under the Finance Act of 1894 would be construed in a liberal spirit, and full effect given to such exemptions as the Act contains; but the method of interpretation sometimes adopted appears rather to be directed to the undue restriction of the relief which the precise language of the Act apparently authorizes.

Some of your readers may be concerned in cases to which section 21 (5) is applicable, which reads as follows:—

"Where a husband or wife is entitled, either solely or jointly with the other, to the income of any property settled by the other under a disposition which has taken effect before the commencement of this part of this Act, and on his or her death the survivor becomes entitled to the income of the property settled by such survivor, estate duty shall not be payable in respect of that property until the death of the survivor."

This sub-section is now interpreted as if the word "only" occurred after the word "income" in the connection "income of the property settled by such survivor"; but the conditions specified as necessary for claiming this exemption are these:—

1st. That the deceased took for life under a disposition which took effect before the date of the Act.

2nd. That upon his death the surviving spouse became entitled to the income of the property.

3rd. That the surviving spouse was the settlor.

The enactment does not prescribe that the survivor should take a life estate and no more, and the fact that a power of appointment is superadded to the life estate in the settlement cannot disentitle the person entitled to a life estate to claim the exemption which is specifically in favour of a person entitled to a life estate.

There is no authority for reading the sub-section as if the word "only" were added to the word "income"; it must be construed strictly without adding or subtracting ought.

It was no more by an accident that the word "only" was not added to the word "income" in this sub-section to qualify the meaning and limit the exemption than that the word "only" was inserted as necessary in section 5 (1) (a) dealing with the conditions under which settlement estate duty is to be paid, and limiting the exemption, if the life interest of a wife or husband is not the only life interest under the settlement.

It will be observed that no duty can now be raised out of the corpus of the fund without reducing the income for life of the surviving spouse, which it was the peculiar care of the Legislature in this sub-section to provide against at all events, and therefore the surviving spouse cannot be excluded from the benefit of the exemption without contravening the language and purpose of the Act.

SCRUTATOR.

SHARING STOCKBROKERS' COMMISSIONS.

[To the Editor of the *Solicitors' Journal*.]

Sir,—Referring to the correspondence in your columns relating to disbursements and to your remarks in your issue of the 1st of August, 1896, we shall be glad to know how far the practice you refer to of solicitors sharing stockbrokers' commissions is universal. You were careful to say that the practice is adopted by all stockbrokers, and you seem partially to justify solicitors benefiting by it.

It seems to us it is only a degree better than the "Country Solicitor's" practice, whose action has been so severely and justifiably denounced. We had hoped that others would have questioned your semi-apology for the practice.

We feel perfectly sure that if a client were to sue his solicitor for the commission he had received, the solicitor would not dare to allow the matter to come into court.

CITY SOLICITORS.

London.

[See observations under the head of "Current Topics."—ED. S.J.]

DISBURSEMENTS.

[To the Editor of the *Solicitors' Journal*.]

Sir,—Under this head you have a correspondence. Very properly, the writers strongly condemn the practice which a "Country Solicitor" recently in your columns had the boldness (to use a very mild term) to attempt to justify. If he continues his practice in that direction he may at no distant date be made to "sit up" by the Lord Chief Justice, as was a formerly eminent gentleman hailing from an eastern county very lately, and one of the Lord Chief Justice's findings was on the very practice that "Country Solicitor" supports.

There can be no difference of opinion on this matter as between London and Country Solicitors. All respectable men (town or country) must think alike on the subject.

CONSTANT SUBSCRIBER.

NEW ORDERS, &c.

RULE 4^{ta} OF SUPREME COURT FUNDS RULES, 1896.

41a. *Payment into court under Life Assurance Companies (Payment into Court) Act, 1896.* Where a company desires to lodge money in court under the Life Assurance Companies (Payment into Court) Act, 1896, there shall be annexed to the affidavit directed to be made by Order LIV., C., rule 1, of the Rules of the Supreme Court or any substituted rule, a lodgment schedule stating the title and address of the company, the amount of the money proposed to be lodged, and the ledger credit to which it is to be placed, such ledger credit shall be as follows, with any necessary variations:—In the matter of the Policy No. of the company. An office copy of the schedule is to be left with the paymaster.

On receipt by the paymaster of any subsequent notice of claim transmitted by such company pursuant to their undertaking referred to in sub-section (c) of the said rule, he shall retain the same and make an entry thereof in his books; and on any certificate of the fund to which such notice refers he shall notify the same of the person giving such notice and the date thereof.

The paymaster shall also, upon such request as is mentioned in rule 100, and upon payment of the same fee as is payable for a transcript under that rule, supply a copy of such notice.

Signed and certified to be urgent.

10th Aug., 1896.

HALSBURY, C.

We concur—

H. T. ANSTRUTHER,

W. H. FISHER,

Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

LONG VACATION, 1896.

Notice.

During the Vacation until further Notice:—All Applications which may require to be immediately or promptly heard, are to be made to the Judges who for the time being shall act as Vacation Judges.

COURT BUSINESS.—Mr. Justice Cave, one of the Vacation Judges, will, until further notice, sit in Court VIII., Royal Courts of Justice, at 11 a.m. on Wednesday in every week, commencing on Wednesday, 23rd of September, for the purpose of hearing such Applications of the above nature as, according to the practice in the Chancery Division, are usually heard in Court.

No Case will be placed in the Judge's Paper unless leave has been previously obtained, or a Certificate of Counsel that the Case requires to be immediately or promptly heard, and stating concisely the reasons, is left with the Papers.

The necessary Papers, relating to every Application made to the Vacation Judges (see notice below as to Judges' Papers), are to be left with the Cause Clerk in attendance, Chancery Registrars' Chambers, Room 136, Royal Courts of Justice, before 1 o'clock on the Monday previous to the day on which the Application is intended to be made. When the Cause Clerk is not in attendance, they may be left at Room 136, under cover, addressed to him, and marked outside Chancery Vacation Papers, or they may be sent by post, but in either case so as to be received by the time aforesaid.

URGENT MATTERS WHEN JUDGE NOT PRESENT IN COURT OR CHAMBERS.—Application may be made in any Case of urgency, to the Judge by post or rail, prepaid, accompanied by the brief of Counsel, office copies of the affidavits in support of the application, and also by a minute, on a separate sheet of paper, signed by Counsel, of the order he may consider the Applicant entitled to, and also an envelope, sufficiently stamped, capable of receiving the papers, addressed as follows:—"Chancery Official Letter: To the Registrar in Vacation, Chancery Registrars' Chambers, Royal Courts of Justice, London, W.C."

On Applications for Injunctions, in addition to the above, a copy of the writ, and a certificate of writ issued, must also be sent.

The papers sent to the Judge will be returned to the Registrar.

The address of the Judge for the time being acting as Vacation Judge can be obtained on application at Chancery Registrars' Chambers, Room 136.

CHANCERY CHAMBER BUSINESS.—The Chambers of Mr. Justice North will be open on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday in every week, from 10 to 2 o'clock. Mr. Justice CAVE will, until further notice, hear urgent Summons which may be adjourned to him in his Private Room, No. 660, in the Royal Courts of Justice (Carey-street Entrance), on Wednesday in every week, commencing on Wednesday, 23rd of September, at 10.30.

QUEEN'S BENCH CHAMBER BUSINESS.—Mr. Justice CAVE will, until further notice, sit for the disposal of Queen's Bench Business in Judges' Chambers on Tuesday in every week, at 11 a.m., commencing on Tuesday, 22nd of September. Cases in the Queen's Bench Summons List will be called on, and disposed of peremptorily in the order in which they stand in the Day's List, but not earlier than the time at which the Section in which they are respectively placed is marked to come on.

DIVORCE.—Decrees nisi will be made absolute in Court on Wednesday, the 16th September, and Thursday, 15th October.

JUDGE'S PAPERS FOR USE IN COURT.—Chancery Division.—The following papers for the Vacation Judge, are required to be left with the Cause Clerk in attendance at the Chancery Registrars' Chambers, Room 136, Royal Courts of Justice, on or before 1 o'clock, on the Monday previous to the day on which the application to the Judge is intended to be made:

1.—Counsel's Certificate of Urgency, or Note of Special Leave granted by the Judge.

2.—Two Copies of Writ and two Copies of Pleadings (if any), and any other documents shewing the nature of the Application.

3.—Two Copies of Notice of Motion.

4.—Office Copy Affidavits in support, and also Affidavits in answer (if any).

N.B.—Solicitors are requested when the Application has been disposed of, to apply at once to the Judge's Clerk in Court for the return of their papers.

NOTICE TO SOLICITORS.

(CHANCERY REGISTRARS' OFFICE.)

The Chancery Registrars' Office will be open daily. On Monday, the 21st September, and on the same day in every succeeding week during the Vacation, the Registrar in attendance will see Solicitors requiring alterations necessary in Orders to be acted on by the Paymaster; but the Order, and any necessary Papers, and a notification of the amendment as required by the 27th of the Supreme Court Funds Rules, 1886, ought to be left at his Seat not later than 12 o'clock on the previous Saturday.

The Local Government Board have issued to the clerks of town, county, and district councils, circulars calling attention to the legislation of the past Session, whereby those bodies are affected. The circular is in each case accompanied by a Board of Trade memorandum on the subject of the Light Railways Act, 1896, setting out the powers conferred on town and county councils under the Act, and explaining the rules which the Board of Trade propose to provide with respect to notice of intention to apply for an order authorizing a light railway.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

Before the Vacation Judge.

Re THE TRUSTS OF THE WILL OF THE LATE GEORGE HARRY, SEVENTH EARL OF STAMFORD AND WARRINGTON, AND Re: THE TRUSTEE ACT, 1893—16th September.

TRUSTEE—SALE OF LAND WITH RESERVATION OF MINERALS—SANCTION OF COURT—EVIDENCE—TRUSTEE ACT, 1893 (56 & 57 VICT. c. 53), s. 44.

This was a petition under section 44 of the Trustee Act, 1893, by the trustees of the will of the late Earl of Stamford and Warrington that they might be at liberty to sell land for the time being subject to the uses and trusts of the said will or any part thereof with a reservation of minerals. In support of the petition, it was stated that the parties to it were the trustees and the tenant for life. The land was situated in a mining district, and a contract of sale had been entered into. The late earl had for many years been accustomed to sell the surface for building purposes separately from the minerals. In 1856 he sold land at Amblecote, part of the Staffordshire estates, to the Stourbridge Waterworks Co., and that company had recently requested the petitioners to sell them additional adjacent land, and the petitioners were willing to sell such land, but they desired to make a similar reservation of mines and minerals. The land was in a mining district. There was evidence by the solicitor and executor of the late earl, who had acted as such solicitor for thirty-six years, that the value of the land was not diminished by the minerals and surface being sold separately. The late earl was tenant in fee, and no provision upon the subject was contained in the will. A general power was asked for.

CHIFFY, J., said that upon the evidence the order asked for would be made.—COUNSEL, Fossett & Lush. SOLICITORS, Bower, Cotton, & Bower.

[Reported by J. E. ALDOUS, Barrister-at-Law.]

LIPMAN v. BRANCH & SONS—16th September.

DESIGN—INFRINGEMENT—MOTION FOR INJUNCTION—NOVELTY—FORM OF ORDER.

This was a motion on behalf of the plaintiff, Mr. John Lipman, that the defendants, their servants and agents, might be restrained until the trial of the action or further order from manufacturing, selling, or offering for sale, or in any manner dealing with (without the licence or consent of the plaintiff) any shoes or boots to which the plaintiff's design, registered on the 28th of September, 1895, and numbered 262,765, or any part thereof, or any colourable imitation thereof, had been applied, and from in any way infringing the rights of the plaintiff in the said design. In support of the motion, it was submitted that the defendants could not dispute the novelty of the design upon the present motion. The design was one for the shape of a shoe. Prior to the plaintiff's design Oxford shoes with a combination of buttons and a strap were not known. He introduced that combination. The evidence shewed that no such shoe was known prior to the plaintiff's design. There was expert evidence that the design was valuable.

CHIFFY, J.—Upon motion for an injunction the plaintiff must shew that the design is novel. I am not impressed with the magnitude of the invention. This is not a case that ought to be dealt with on the present motion. The order would be in the nature of a final and not an *interim* order. Upon the undertaking of the defendants not to deal with or make any shoes of the plaintiff's registered design, the motion will stand till the third motion day in next sittings.—COUNSEL, Bacon (Pochin with him); E. Bray. SOLICITORS, Boulton, Sons, & Sandeman; Holder & Wood.

[Reported by J. E. ALDOUS, Barrister-at-Law.]

LEGAL NEWS.

OBITUARY.

Mr. J. E. C. Monro, barrister, who died last week, was for many years Professor of Law at Owens College, Manchester, but in 1892 he resigned that post and removed to London, and he was appointed assistant reader to the Council of Legal Education. He was an unsuccessful candidate for East Manchester at the elections of 1892 and 1895. The *Manchester Guardian*, in a long and appreciative notice of Mr. Monro's career, says that "to his friends the loss is a heavy one, and even his political opponents—for personal enemies he could hardly have found—will join in the deep regret that a career of such high promise should have been cut short by an untimely death."

INFORMATION WANTED.

The Insurance Office in which the late Mr. JAMES HAMILTON BROWN insured his life or personal effects is requested to communicate with Messrs. Remnant and Sandars, solicitors, of 11, Lincoln's-inn-fields, London, W.C.

GENERAL.

It is stated that the Lord Chief Justice has finished his Canadian tour, and is visiting Mr. Thomson, vice-president of the Pennsylvania Railroad, at his suburban residence near Philadelphia.

The death is announced of Mr. D. Boyle Hope, Sheriff Principal of Roxburgh, Berwick, and Selkirk, whose body was found floating in the

Sept. 19, 1896.

sea near Portobello, Midlothian. He was a grandson of the Right Hon. Charles Hope, of Granton, Lord President of the Court of Session.

The somewhat anomalous proposition that a woman may recover in her own name damages for her own seduction, was, says the *Central Law Journal*, asserted recently in an Indiana case, *Henniger v. Lomas*. The decision was warranted by a statute of that State providing that "any unmarried female may prosecute as plaintiff an action for her own seduction, and may recover therein such damages as may be assessed in her favour. The case decided that though a woman marries her seducer, she may, if the marriage has been annulled on her application, sue the seducer.

One by one, says the *Daily Telegraph*, the vestiges of Old London are steadily disappearing. Soon Clement's Inn, at the junction of Fleet-street and the Strand, will be no more, its place being taken by brand-new offices and chambers, the property of a limited company. What reader of Shakspere does not remember Justice Shallow's boast, "I was once of Clement's Inn, where, I think, they will talk of Mad Shallow yet." Hundreds of years have passed since a hostelry was first built there for the comfort of pilgrims to the Holy Well of St. Clement. Its sanctity no longer recognized, the well was covered by a worldly pump, and in 1874 was destroyed altogether by being filled up.

The *Daily News* says that on Monday the Northampton Borough magistrates remanded Charles Wilkins, described as an electrical engineer, of Sutherland-avenue, Maida-vale, London, with several aliases; and Edward Thomas, giving an address in Keppel-street, Russell-square, London, charged with attempting to defraud Messrs. Markhams, a Northampton firm of solicitors, of £20. It is alleged against the prisoners that they have pursued in Northampton, Leamington, Southampton, Leicester, and other places a series of frauds on solicitors by sending forged telegrams purporting to come from their London agents instructing the solicitors to pay over a sum of money to one of the prisoners. Messrs. Markhams received a telegram, supposed to come from their London agents, to pay Wilkins £20, but, themselves making telegraphic inquiries, they gave Wilkins into custody when he called for the money. Thomas was arrested in London as the sender of the telegram. It is said that solicitors have been defrauded all over the country. The Public Prosecutor has intimated his intention of taking up the case, and the prisoners will probably be removed to London for trial.

An interesting question of circumstantial evidence, says the *Albany Law Journal*, furnished by the tracking of a dog, has been decided in the case of *State of Ohio v. Hall* (3 Ohio Legal News, 147). In this case the State called as a witness one Britton, and offered to prove by him that he was the owner of a bloodhound about nine years old; that the dog had carefully been trained to follow the scent of human tracks; that it had been previously tested and found to follow such tracks with success and certainty; that such tests had been made by putting the dog on the trail of persons who had started out on foot from twenty to forty hours ahead of the hound to see if it could follow them; that it had also been tested in following tracks from places where crimes had been committed and that persons thus trailed by the dog had, in a number of cases, confessed their guilt; that in the case on trial, on Sunday evening, after the burglary on Saturday night, a basket filled with a part of the stolen property had been found under a freight car about 200 yards from the place of the burglary; that the dog had been taken to the spot where the basket was found and had trailed from that place. The defendant objected to admitting as evidence anything concerning the training and testing of the dog and as to its alleged tracking or trailing to the house. The court held that the evidence was competent to go to the jury with other testimony as a circumstance tending to connect the accused with the crime.

WARNING TO INTENDING HOUSE PURCHASERS AND LESSERS.—Before purchasing or renting a house, have the Sanitary Arrangements thoroughly Examined by an Expert from The Sanitary Engineering Co. (Carter Bros.), c5, Victoria-street, Westminster. Fee for a London house, 2 guineas; Country by arrangement. (Established 1875.)—[ADVT.]

THE PROPERTY MART.

SALES OF ENSUING WEEK.

Sept. 22.—Messrs. BEAK, BURNETT, & ELDERIDGE, at the Mart, Freehold Ground-Rents, amounting to £155 10s., secured upon Residences. Solicitor, N. Herbert Smith, Esq., London.

Sept. 23.—Messrs. HERRING, SON, & DAW, at the Mart, at 2, Freehold Ground-Rents, amounting to £662 10s., secured upon 111 Houses and Shop at Fulham, Wimbledon, Canning Town, and Hornsey, with Reversions. Solicitors, Fowler, Perks, & Co., London.

RESULTS OF SALES.

SALE OF REVERSIONS AND LIFE POLICIES.—Messrs. H. E. FOSTER & CRANFIELD held their 57th Periodical Sale of these interests on Thursday, the 17th inst., and were again successful in disposing of the bulk of the lots offered. The following are some of the prices realized: Absolute Reversion to Leasehold Ground-Rents and Property, sold £3,500; Absolute Reversion to Two Leasehold Houses at Kentish Town, sold £250; Life Policy for £14,767, life aged 30, sold £1,010; Life Policy for £1,000 on life of Princess Louise, sold £420; Life Policy for £500 and bonuses, life 69, sold (prior to sale) £450.

WINDING UP NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Sept. 11.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

ALLIANCE CONTRACTING CO., LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Sept 1, directed to be heard before Cave, J., at the Royal Courts, on Sept 23. Taunton & Dade, Copthall avenue, solors for petitioner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Sept 23.

ARMSTRONG PROPELLER CO., LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Aug 21, directed to be heard on Oct 23. Greening, Fenwick st, solor for petitioners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 27.

BOARDMAN'S BREWERIES, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 23, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to G. P. Robertson and J. Gowen-Stobo, 77, King st, Manchester.

SOUTH LONDONDERRY GOLD AND EXPLORATION, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 17, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to William Fenton Pugh, 11, Queen Victoria st, Parker & Co, St Michael's Rectory, Cornhill.

UNITED WINE GROWERS, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Sept 9, directed to be heard on Sept 23. Dowson & Co, 19, Surrey st, Victoria embankment, solors for petitioner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Sept 22.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

ABBOSBURY RAILWAY CO.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 15, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to John Hancock, 8, Victoria st, Westminster. Hargrove, 16, Victoria st, solor.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

LOVERS OF JUSTICE AND PEACE, 145, Duke st, Liverpool. Sept 2.

LOYAL YOUTH'S RESOLUTION LODGE INDEPENDENT ODD FELLOWS, Royal Hotel, Risworth, Halifax, York. Aug 26.

PALM LODGE OF JUVENILE FREE GARDENERS, Riggall's Coffee Hall, Old Market Place, Grimsby, Lincoln. Sept 2.

STAR ON ERIN FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Netley Hotel, Walton rd, Liverpool. July 22.

UNITED KINGDOM POST OFFICE SICK BENEFIT SOCIETY, Eastern District Post Office, Commercial rd East, E. Sept 2.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Sept. 15.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

BONNICK & CO., LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 18, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to James Rhodes, 108, Colmore row, Birmingham. Shakespeare & Co, Birmingham, solors for liquidator.

CITY AND WESTMINSTER CONTRACT CORPORATION, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Sept 9, directed to be heard on Oct 28. Faithfull & Owen, 11, Victoria st, Westminster, solors for petitioner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 27.

DINETZ, DAVIS, & CO., LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Sept 1, directed to be heard on Oct 28. Linklater & Co, 2, Bond st, Walbrook, solors for petitioner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 27.

FARNHAM BREWERY CO., LIMITED.—Creditors are requested, on or before Oct 26, to send their names and addresses and particulars of their debts or claims, to William Curtis Thomson, 15, George st, Mansion House, Kempton, Farnham, solor to liquidator.

HANNAH'S VENTURE SYNDICATE, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 20, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts and claims, to Charles Walter Grimwade, 38, Coleman st.

HULEBUT CLARIDGE & CO., LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Sept 3, directed to be heard on Sept 23. Kinch & Co, Aldergate st, solors for petitioners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Sept 22.

J. ALLISON & CO., LIMITED.—By an order, dated Sept 2, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the company be continued. Phelps & Co, solors for company.

NORTH-WEST AFRICAN CO., LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 23, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Alfred Brookes, Lytham, or George Raynor, 132, Cheapside, London. Fowler & Co, Clement's lane, solors to the liquidators.

RHODESIAN CLAIMS, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Lydstone Joseph Langmead, 23, College hill, Burn & Berridge, 11, Old Broad st, solors to the liquidator.

RHODESIAN MINERAL PROPERTIES, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Lydstone Joseph Langmead, 23, College hill, Burn & Berridge, Old Broad st, solors to the liquidator.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

ANSTY CO-OPERATIVE BOOT AND SHOE MANUFACTURING SOCIETY, LIMITED, Main st, Ansty, Leicester. Sept 9.

FAITH, HOPE, AND CHARITY BENEFIT SOCIETY, Thorngate Memorial Hall, Gosport, Southampton. Sept 9.

GOOD INTENT FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Peel's Hotel, Barton st, Blackburn, Lancs. Sept 2.

GOOD INTENT LODGE ANCIENT ORDER OF DRUIDS, Miners' Arms Inn, Gildersome, Leeds. Sept 9.

HAND-IN-HAND FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Horse and Groom Inn, New Alresford, Hants. Sept 9.

KINGS BROMLEY NEW FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Royal Oak Inn, Kings Bromley, Lichfield, Staffs. Sept 9.

CREDITORS' NOTICES.

UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Sept. 15.

TUCKER, FRANCES HANNAH, Upper St Martin's lane, Charing Cross. Oct 21. Sergeant v Tucker, Kekewich, J. Hatchett-Jones, Mark lane.

UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Sept. 8.

ALLAN, JOHN, Gt Yarmouth Sept 29. Harmer & Ruddock, Gt Yarmouth.

BORRETT, JOHN, Hickling, Norfolk Oct 9. Worship & Rising, Gt Yarmouth.

BOROWDALE, MATTHEW, Penrith, Cumberland Sept 19. Arnison & Co, Penrith.

BROADBENT, CATHERINE, Leigh, Lancs Oct 15. Widdows, Leigh.

CHANTLER, JAMES LAWTON, Latchford, Chester, Beerhouse, Keeper Oct 21. Longland, Warrington.

CROOK, RICHARD, Cambridge Oct 16. Ginn & Matthews, Cambridge.

GALLOWAY, ELIZABETH, Birkenhead Nov 15. Whitley & Co, Liverpool.

LOCKYER, ELIZABETH MARY ANN, Holloway Nov 11. Geo & W Webb, New Broad st.

ALLIANCE CONTRACTING CO., LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Sept 1, directed to be heard before Cave, J., at the Royal Courts, on Sept 23. Taunton & Dade, Copthall avenue, solors for petitioner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Sept 23.

NEEDHAM, GEORGE, Sheffield, Plumber Oct 5 Wheat, Sheffield	SHERWOOD, JOHN, Stockton on Tees Oct 20 Faber & Co, Stockton on Tees
NEWTON, ANN, Ashford, Kent Dec 1 Norwood, Ashford	STONE, AUGUSTUS EDWARD HENRY, Aldershot Oct 21 Hollist & Co, Farnham, Surrey
OVERETT, CHARLES, Hounslow Sept 30 Jones, High Holborn	STUBBS, JUDITH LOUISE, Beaumont st, Marylebone Oct 30 Barlow & James, Fenchurch st
ALMER, HENRY CORNELIUS, Parkstone, Dorset, Grocer Oct 30 Salter Dickenson, Poole	SWAINE, WILLIAM JOSEPH STUART, Bournemouth Oct 21 Cobbett & Co, Manchester
ARTON, WILLIAM, Wribbenhall, Wors, Builder Sept 23 Marcy & Co, Bewdley	THOMPSON, JOHN, Hulme, Manchester, Ironmonger Oct 17 Lawrence & Co, Manchester
PHILLIPS, SAMUEL, New Basford, Nottingham Oct 10 Martin & Sons, Nottingham	TREVITHICK, MARY ISABELLA, Exwick, nr Exeter Oct 14 Sparks & Co, Exeter
SHAPOOTT, HENRY McKEEVER, Plymouth, Clerc Oct 24 Gidley & Son, Plymouth	TURNER, ALICE, Dalton, Lancaster Sept 23 Park, Ulverston
SNAPE, ALFRED WILLIAM, Bury St Edmunds Sept 30 Clarke & Co, Gresham house	WADE, WILLIAM, Leeds Oct 7 Emsley & Co, Leeds
SOMMER, CHARLES JOHN HENRY, Northumbrial, Merchant Oct 10 Cooper & Goodger, Newcastle on Tyne	WALTER, JOHN JAMES, Blackheath Nov 12 Wilson & Leye, Plymouth
SOUTHAN, THOMAS, Shrewsbury Nov 1 G R & C E Wace, Shrewsbury	WARDER, JANE EDITH, Farnborough, Southampton Oct 23 Hollist & Co, Farnham, Surrey
THOMPSON, ELIZA, Camberwell Oct 7 Bridge, Cophall avenue	WATSON, EMMA, Sheffield Oct 24 Wightman & Parker, Sheffield
WADSWORTH, ANNE, Nottingham Oct 28 Watson & Co, Nottingham	WATTS, SIDNEY JAMES, Wootton Bassett, Wilts, Grocer Oct 17 Bevir, Wootton Bassett
WRIGHT, ROBERT, Newcastle upon Tyne Oct 15 Josl & Parsons, Newcastle upon Tyne	WELESTEAD, LUCY ANN, Wool, Dorset Nov 7 Symonds & Sons, Dorchester
WRIGLEY, THOMAS, Southport Oct 19 Brooks & Co, Ashton under Lyne	WESTCOTT, JAMES, Gt Grimsby Oct 8 Brown, Gt Grimsby
	WEIGHT, SARAH, Dewsbury, York Oct 6 Watts & Son, Dewsbury

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Sept. 11.

ANNACKER, PETER, Manchester Oct 31 Innes, Manchester	LONDON GAZETTE.—TUESDAY, Sept 15.
ARCHEDALE, MERVYN, Castle Archdale, Fermanagh Oct 30 Garvey, Dublin	ARCHDALE, MERVYN, Fermanagh Oct 30 Garvey, Dublin
AUSTIN, THOMAS JAMES, Laleham, South Norwood Park Oct 31 Letts Brothers, Bartlett's bldgs	BENSON, THOMAS, Hampstead Oct 10 Peacock & Goddard, South sq, Gray's inn
BEDDING, JAMES WILLIAM DAVID, Pangbourne, Berks Nov 11 Hepworth & Co, South st, Finchley	BEVERLEY, CLARA, Manchester Oct 24 Dixon & Linnell, Manchester
BEDFORD, JOSEPH, Lutterworth, Leics Oct 26 Watson, Lutterworth	DAVIES, JOHN HENRY, Sutton, Surrey Oct 14 Routh & Co, Southampton st, Bloomsbury
BRADSHAW, JOHN, Ilkley, York Oct 1 Lupton & Fawcett, Leeds	EY, AUGUSTUS DE GRAND, Upper Thames st Oct 15 Triemer, Pinner's ct
BROMMAGE, ALFRED, Wolverhampton Oct 26 Court & Perry, Wolverhampton	DYSON, FRIEND, Shaw, nr Oldham Oct 12 Standing & Co, Shaw
BURGESS, RICHARD, Winchester Sept 26 Godwin, Winchester	EDWARDS, ANN, Swansea Oct 15 Cooper, Swansea
COATES, ABSALOM, Middleborough, Joiner Oct 26 Turnbull & Moody, Scarborough	FELTON, ROBERT, Cambridge Oct 20 Walker, Cambridge
CORDY, MARTHA, Felixstowe, Suffolk Oct 15 Grimwade, Hadleigh	FROST, ALICE, Kidderminster Oct 14 Restall, Birmingham
DUDNEY, MARTHA, Erith, Kent Oct 24 Harold & Co, Furnival's inn, Holborn	FROST, EMILY, Birmingham Oct 14 Restall, Birmingham
DUNCKLEY, HENRY, Fallowfield, Lancs, Journalist Nov 23 Dendy & Paterson, Manchester	GREENWOOD, JAMES, Burnley Oct 19 Procter & Baldwin, Burnley
EDWARDS, ANN, Cardiff Oct 9 Merrills & Ede, Cardiff	HAIKE, CHARLES HERBERT, Meltham, York, Tailor Oct 31 Wilson, Mirfield
FIRBANK, CHRISTOPHER GEORGE, St Marychurch, Torquay Oct 23 Dauncey, Newport, Mon	LINTON, JOHN, Egremont, Cheshire Oct 24 Lowndes & Co, Liverpool
FORBES, CHARLOTTE LOUISA, Bitton, nr Bristol Nov 11 Lawrence & Co, New sq, Lincoln's inn	LITTLE, GEORGE, Southport Nov 1 Mawdley, Southport
GARRETT, MARY DODDS, Felling, Durham Oct 24 Swinburne, Gateshead	MAJOR, EMMA, Brighton Oct 24 Mirams, Brighton
HALL, HENRY, Westmorland, Jamaica, Planter Oct 12 Pennington & Co, Lincoln's inn fields	MARSHFIELD, EMMA, Liverpool Oct 14 Wright & Co, Liverpool
HALLER, THOMAS, Kingston upon Hull Nov 9 Leak & Co, Hull	MARSDEN, THOMAS, Dowall, nr Buxton, Derby, Farmer Oct 9 Gratton & Marsden, Chesterfield
JUMP, DAVID, Leyland, Lancs Oct 12 Clarke, Preston	MAYNE, JANE ELIZA, St Helens, I W Oct 18 Ratcliffe, Ryde
KENNEDY, AERLIA MARIA, Sydenham Oct 14 Arnold & Henry White, Gt Marlborough street	MCINTOSH, JAMES, Ely pl, Oct 31 Lyne & Holman, Gt Winchester st
LEVIN, VICTORIA AMELIA, Chalcot crescent, Regent's Park Oct 14 Rodgers & Co, Wallbrook	MILES, JOHN, Selside, Westmorland, Farmer Oct 10 Dobson, Kendal
NATUSCH, FREDERIC BERNSTEIN BERNARD, Lee Oct 10 Waltons & Co, Leadenhall st	PARSONS, EDMUND, Hinton rd, Loughborough Junction Oct 20 Turner & Co, Cheapside
NICHOLSON, JOSEPH, Cumbri Oct 14 Little & Lamony, Penrith	TURNER, MATILDA, Bedminster, Bristol Oct 5 Spofforth, Bristol
PRECEVAL, ERNEST AUGUSTUS, Henbury, nr Bristol Oct 14 Arnold & Henry White, Gt Marlborough st	WALKER, WILLIAM, Twyford, Hants, Baker Oct 25 Dowling, Winchester
PLUES, JOHN, Blackburn Oct 17 L & W Wilkinson, Blackburn	WARNE, THOMAS SAMUEL, Rochester Nov 10 Prall & Co, Rochester
	WHEELHOUSE, WILLIAM, York Oct 20 Atlay Shaftoe, York
	WHITEHEAD, ROBERT, Oldham Oct 19 Tweedale & Co, Oldham
	WILTSHIRE, ELIZA, Pimlico, Grocer Oct 28 Yelding & Co, Vincent sq

BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Sept. 11.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BERKSHIRE, WILLIAM, South Shields, Plasterer Newcastle on Tyne Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8	ORDER RESCINDING RECEIVING ORDER AND ANNULLING ADJUDICATION.
BONNIE, JAMES, Bedlington, Northumbrial, Innkeeper Newcastle on Tyne Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7	BROWNE, JAMES LOXHAM, The Vale, Hampstead, Artist High Court Rec Oct 3 Adjud March 10 Resc and Annul Sept 7
BRIDGE, OLIVER JOHN, Ipswich, Clothier Ipswich Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7	FIRST MEETINGS.
BRYDEN, GEORGE, Gloucester, Draper's Traveller Gloucester Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8	ASPINALL, JOHN, Burnley, Lancs, Grocer Sept 18 at 2 County Court house, Blackburn
CROOKES, ISAAC, Sheffield, Joiner Sheffield Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 9	BAKER, WALTER COLLINS, Batcombe, Somersets Sept 18 at 12 Off Rec, Bank chmrs, Corn st, Bristol
ELVIN, EDWARD JOHN, Shepherd's Bush, Licensed Victualler High Court Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9	BARCHAM, THOMAS MORRIS, Hassington, Norfolk, Farmer Sept 13 at 12.30 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
GAIN, JONATHAN, Fulham, Actor High Court Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5	BOWMAN, WILLIAM, Darlington, Boot Dealer Sept 23 at 3 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesbrough
HARRISON, CECIL, Hove, Coal Agent High Court Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9	BROWN, ARTHUR, Scarning, Norfolk, Cattle Dealer Sept 19 at 11 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
HIBB, WALTER, Bishopston, Bristol, Fish Salesman Bristol Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9	BROWN, ALFRED HENRY, Newport, Mon, Boot Manufacturer Sept 18 at 12 Off Rec, Gloucester Bank chmrs, Newport, Mon
HUDSON, WILLIAM HENRY, Nottingham Nottingham Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8	BURTON, DAVID, St Shields, Innkeeper Sept 21 at 11 Off Rec, 30, Mosley st, Newcastle on Tyne
JAMES, JOHN, St Iahmaels, Pembroke, Farmer Pembroke Dock Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8	CHAFFER, JAMES, Leeds Sept 21 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park Row, Leeds
KNIGHT & CO, Tunbridge Wells Tunbridge Wells Pet Aug 10 Ord Sept 7	COOKSEY, JOSEPH, Stone, Staffs, Innkeeper Sept 21 at 10.45 Wright & Westhead, St Martin's pl, Stafford
MANNERINGS, HENRY, and JOHN MANNERINGS, Maidstone, Printers Maidstone Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8	CUNDELL, SELINA MARY, Broughton Gifford, Wilts Sept 23 at 12 Off Rec, Bank chmrs, Corn st, Bristol
MEYER, CHARLES, Swansea Swansea Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9	DAVIES, JOS, Pontypriod, Baker Sept 18 at 12.30, High st, Mortby Tydfil
NEEDHAM, CHARLES, Leicester, Machine Broker Leicester Pet Aug 20 Ord Sept 9	DAWSON, GEORGE EWANS, Friskney, Lincs, Potato Dealer Oct 1 at 12.45 Off Rec, 48, High st, Boston
PERRY, CHARLES HYDE, Southsea, Restaurant Keeper Portsmouth Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7	EMERY, ALICE SOPHIA, South Lambeth rd Sept 18 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
PEARSON, JOHN, WILLIAM, Briggate, Leeds, Clerk Leeds Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9	EVANS, DAVID, Old Bethnal Green rd, Dairymen Sept 18 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st, London
POYNER, GEORGE, Ashby de la Zouch, Grocer Burton on Trent Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7	FREMLIN, PHILIP, Lamberhurst, Kent, Farmer Sept 18 at 2 C J Parfis, 65, High st, Tunbridge Wells
PRINCE, E. C. Coventry st, Piccadilly High Court Pet Aug 21 Ord Sept 9	HALSON, ALFRED BLOMFIELD, Kirtle Sept 21 at 11.30, High st, Rochester
SHENK, THOMAS, Clifford, Hereford, Farmer Hereford Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9	HICK, WALTER, Lostwithiel, Cornwall, Cattle Dealer Sept 19 at 12 Off Rec, Boscombe st, Truro
TURNER, GEORGE WILLIAM, Leeds, Wheelwright Leeds Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7	HIGGINBOTTON, WILLIAM, Derby, Silek Thruster Sept 18 at 12 Off Rec, 40, St Mary's gate, Derby
WALKER, HENRY, Stoke Golding, Leicester, Farmer Leicestershire Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8	HIRD, WALTER, Bishopston, Bristol, Fish Salesman Sept 23 at 12.30 Off Rec, Bank chmrs, Corn st, Bristol
	JENNINGS, HENRY, Swansea, Grocer Sept 18 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Alexander rd, Swansea
	LOCKWOOD, FRANKLIN, Dewsbury Sept 18 at 11 Off Rec, Bank chmrs, Batley
	MANNERINGS, HENRY, and JOHN MANNERINGS, Maidstone, Printers Sept 23 at 10 Off Rec, 8, King st, Maidstone
	MASTER, FRANK, Kingston on Thames, Clerk Sept 21 at 11.30 24, Railway app, London Bridge
	MILLS, GEORGE, Hartlepool, Innkeeper Sept 18 at 4.30 Royal Hotel, West Hartlepool
	MINNIS, SAMUEL, Middlesbrough, Iron Manufacturer Sept 23 at 3 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesbrough
	MURSELL, CHARLES ALEXANDER, Middlesbrough, Tea Merchant Sept 22 at 12.15 Station Hotel, York
	REDMORE, ELIZABETH ANN, and DOROTHY MASON, South Shields, Chemists Sept 21 at 12 Off Rec, 30, Mosley st, Newcastle on Tyne
	PETERS, WILLIAM, Sealand, Cheshire, Fishmonger Sept 18 at 12 Crypt chmrs, Eastgate row, Chester
	RIX, BENJAMIN WILLIAM, Curpusty, Norfolk, Farmer Sept 19 at 1 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norfolk
	ROLLS, JOHN ALBERT JOSEPH, Farnham, Surrey, Draper Sept 13 at 12.30 24, Railway app, London Bridge
	SHAW, ISAAC BINGOLY, Nottingham, Music Seller Sept 18 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st, London
	SLEPPER, WALTER GROSE, Upper Sheringham, Norfolk Farmer Sept 19 at 12 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
	SMITH, THOMAS ISAAC, Harwood Dale, York, Farmer Sept 18 at 3 Off Rec, 74, Newborough st, Scarborough
	SNOWDEN, WILLIAM ALFRED, Scarborough, Grocer Sept 22 at 3 Off Rec, 74, Newborough st, Scarborough
	SPENCE, JOHN KIRKHAM, Spennymoor, Lincs, Ironmonger Oct 1 at 12.15 Off Rec, 48, High st, Boston
	SUTCLIFFE, FRANK, Kirkbymoorside, York, Innkeeper Sept 23 at 11.30 Court house, Northallerton
	TODD, JAMES, Ashbourne, Derby Sept 18 at 12 Off Rec, 74, Newborough st, Scarborough
	UNDERHILL, OREGO, Southborough, Kent, Farmer Sept 18 at 3 Parva, 65, High st, Tunbridge Wells
	WEEDALL, WILLIAM, Norwich, Cheshire, Tailor Sept 23 at 10.45 Royal Hotel, Crewe
	WOOLLIATT, DANIEL JAMES, Darby, Coal Merchant Sept 18 at 12.30 Off Rec, 45, St Mary's gate, Derby

Sept. 19, 1896.

ADJUDICATIONS.

- BALCOM, THOMAS MORRIS, Hasingham, Norfolk, Farmer Norwich Pet Aug 25 Ord Sept 9
 BONNER, JAMES, Bedlington, Northumberland, Innkeeper Newcastle on Tyne Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
 BRIDGE, OLIVER JOHN, Ipswich, Clothier Ipswich Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
 BROWN, THOMAS, Walsall Walsall Pet Sept 2 Ord Sept 3
 BRYDON, GEORGE, Gloucester, Draper's Traveller Gloucester Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8
 CROOKES, ISAAC, Sheffield, Joiner Sheffield Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
 DE WALTER, WILLIAM, Birmingham, Diamond Merchant Birmingham Pet Aug 21 Ord Sept 9
 ELVIN, EDWARD JOHN, Shepherd's Bush, Licensed Victualler High Court Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
 HARRISON, CECIL, Hove, Coal Agent High Court Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
 HIRD, WALTER, Bishopston, Bristol, Fish Salesman Bristol Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
 HUDSON, WILLIAM HENRY, Nottingham Nottingham Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8
 LETCHER, EDWIN MARCUS, and ALFRED WILLIAM MORTON BRIGHT, Hereford, Coal Merchants Hereford Pet Aug 27 Ord Sept 8
 MANNERS, HENRY, and JOHN MANNERS, Maidstone, Printers Maidstone Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8
 MAYO, RICHARD EDWIN, Brixton, Contractor High Court Pet Aug 12 Ord Sept 5
 MEYER, CHARLES, Swansea Swansea Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
 NORRIS, HENRY JAMES, Bishop's Waltham, Surveyor Southampton Pet Aug 20 Ord Sept 8
 PATERSON, JOHN, Leeds, Engineer Leeds Pet July 8 Ord Sept 9
 PRABSON, JOHN WILLIAM, Leeds, Leeds Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
 PERRY, CHARLES HYDE, Southsea, Restaurant Keeper Portsmouth Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
 POYSE, GEORGE, Ashby de la Zouch, Leicestershire, Grocer Burton on Trent Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
 RADDON, JAMES HENRY, Waltham Cross, Herts, Baker Edmonton Pet Sept 3 Ord Sept 5
 SHEE, THOMAS, Clifford, Herefordshire, Farmer Hereford Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
 SMITH, ROBERT ALPHONSE, Hilgay Fen, Norfolk, Farmer King's Lynn Pet August 25 Ord Sept 7
 SWAIN, JOHN WILLIAM, and THOMAS BALL, Cardiff, Oil Merchants Cardiff Pet May 30 Ord Sept 4
 TURNER, FREDERIC PURDEY, Bognor, Cycle Engineer Brighton Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 9
 TURNER, GEORGE WILLIAM, Leeds, Wheelwright Leeds Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
 WALKER, HENRY, Stoke Golding, Leicestershire, Farmer Leicestershire Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 8
 YOUNG, ARTHUR BROOKE, Liddington, Wilts, Farmer Swindon Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 8

ADJUDICATION ANNULLED.

- CRITCHLEY, FRANK, and HENRY WILLIS, Buryeley, Grocers Stafford Adjud Jan 8, 1896 Annul Aug 20, 1896

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, September 15.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

- BALDWIN, ALFRED, Rough Lee, Lancs, Farmer Burnley Pet Aug 25 Ord Sept 10
 BARKS, WILLIAM, Kirkgate, Wakefield Wakefield Pet Sept 10 Ord Sept 10
 BISHOP, JOHN, Burton on Trent, Licensed Victualler Burton on Trent Pet Sept 10 Ord Sept 10
 CHARLES, THOMAS, Cradley Heath, Staffs, Licensed Victualler Dudley Pet Aug 24 Ord Sept 8
 COCKS, CHARLES, Tonquay, Builder Exeter Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
 DIXON, JOHN, Frodsham, Cheshire, Builder Warrington Pet Aug 19 Ord Sept 10
 FLATAU, H, Hackney rd, Shoe Manufacturer High Court Pet Aug 27 Ord Sept 11
 HAMER, HENRY PRICE, Upper Norwood, Tutor High Court Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11
 HUNTER, DAVID STEVENSON, Norfolk st, Strand, Journalist High Court Pet Aug 26 Ord Sept 11
 JENNINGS BROTHERS, Bannistergate, Builders High Court Pet Aug 7 Ord Sept 11
 JOHNSON, W. H., Prince's st, Hanover sq, Decorator High Court Pet Aug 20 Ord Sept 11
 JONES, E. HARRY, Gt Winchester st, High Court Pet Aug 7 Ord Sept 11
 LEACHE, SAMUEL, Upend, Kirtlington, Cambs, Dealer Cambridge Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11
 LYONS, MORRIS, Mile End High Court Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11
 MOORE, JOHN, Twickenham, Builder Brentford Pet Sept 10 Ord Sept 10
 MORGAN, JOHN DAVID, Tylorstown, Glam, Grocer Pontypool Pet Sept 10 Ord Sept 10
 PROGIN, JOSEPH FREDERICK, Longton, Staffs, Publican Stoke upon Trent Pet Sept 10 Ord Sept 10
 PRICE, JOHN, Trebarwith, Glam, Collier Merthyr Tydfil Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
 REED, LEWIS, Tonypool, Glam, Painter Pontypool Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11
 RUSSELL, J. C., Shepherd's Bush, House Dealer High Court Pet Sept 14 Ord Sept 10
 SMITH, GEORGE ENOCH, Cinderford, Glos Gloucester Pet Sept 12 Ord Sept 12
 SMITH, JOSEPH, Penkridge, Staffs, Butcher Stafford Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
 TAYLOR, A. C., Richmond, Surrey Wandsworth Pet July 27 Ord Sept 10
 WALKER, DAVID, Stockwell, Stonemason High Court Pet Sept 10 Ord Sept 10
 WALKER, DAVID, Ebbo Vale, Mon, Boot Dealer Tredegar Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11

FIRST MEETINGS.

- BILLINGTON, WILLIAM THOMAS, Aston, nr Birmingham, Baker Sept 24 at 11.30 Colmore row, Birmingham
 BISHOP, JOHN, Burton on Trent, Victualler Sept 22 at 3.30 Midland Hotel, Station st, Burton on Trent
 BONNER, JAMES, Bedlington, Northumbld, Innkeeper Sept 24 at 10.30 Off Rec, 30, Mosley st, Newcastle on Tyne
 BOULD, NEWMAN, Batley Carr, Yorks Sept 24 at 11 Off Rec, Bank chmbs, Batley
 BRYDEN, GEORGE, Gloucester, Draper's Traveller Sept 22 at 4 Off Rec, Station rd, Gloucester
 COOKE, CHARLES, Tonquay, Builder Sept 25 at 12 Off Rec, 13, Bedford circus, Exeter
 DE WALTER, WILLIAM, Birmingham, Diamond Merchant Sept 23 at 11.30 Colmore row, Birmingham
 EATON, EDWARD, East Macclesfield, Driller Sept 23 at 11 Off Rec, 23, King Edward's Macclesfield
 ELVIN, EDWARD JOHN, Shepherd's Bush, Licensed Victualler Sept 23 at 12 Bankrupt bldgs, Carey st
 EVANS, THOMAS, Gellygaer, Glam, Blacksmith Sept 22 at 3.30 High st, Merthyr Tydfil
 FENTON, A. C., College Hill, Cannon st Sept 22 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 GAIN, JONATHAN, Fulham, Actor Sept 22 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 HAIGH, CHARLES, Dewsbury Sept 24 at 10 Off Rec, Bank chmbs, Batley
 HARBER, STEPHEN, Tettenhall, Wolverhampton, Nurseryman Sept 22 at 10 Off Rec, Wolverhampton
 HARRISON, CECIL, Hove, Coal Agent Sept 23 at 1 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 HASKELL, FREDERICK HARRY, Winton, Bournemouth, Bricklayer Sept 22 at 12.30 Off Rec, Salisbury
 HODGES, CHARLES THOMAS, Stourbridge, Blacksmith Sept 23 at 2 C H Collis, Solicitor, Stourbridge
 LYONS, MORRIS, Mile End Sept 24 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 MEYER, CHARLES, Swansea Sept 23 at 2 Off Rec, 31, Alexandra rd, Swansea
 MORGAN, THOMAS, Gellygaer, Glam, Farmer Sept 22 at 12.30 High st, Merthyr Tydfil
 NEEDHAM, CHARLES, Leicester, Machine Broker Sept 22 at 3 Off Rec, 1, Berriedge st, Leicester
 PERRY, JOHN, Llandudno Sept 24 at 3 Crypt chmbs, Eastgate row, Chester
 POYSE, GEORGE, Ashby de la Zouch, Leicestershire, Grocer Sept 22 at 3 Midland Hotel, Station st, Burton on Trent
 PRINCE, E. C., Coventry st, Piccadilly Sept 21 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 PURSELL, GEORGE, Gloucester, Boot Dealer Sept 22 at 3 Off Rec, Station rd, Gloucester
 RADDON, JAMES HENRY, Waltham Cross, Herts, Baker Sept 23 at 3 Off Rec, 95, Temple chmbs, Temple avenue
 SIMPSON, JOHN HENRY, Cleethorpes, Lincs, Watchmaker Sept 23 at 11 Off Rec, 15, Osborne st, Gt Grimsby
 SWIAKSKI, ALEXANDER, Bradford, Yorks, Chairmaker Sept 23 at 11 Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford
 THOMAS, JOHN, Ystalyfera, Glam Sept 23 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Alexandra rd, Swansea
 WALKER, HENRY, Stoke Golding, Leicester, Farmer Sept 22 at 12 Off Rec, 1, Berriedge st, Leicester
 WEAKES, EDWARD, and HENRY GEORGE HIBSON, Birmingham, Builders Sept 23 at 11.30 Colmore row, Birmingham
 YOUNG, ARTHUR BROOKE, Liddington, Wilts, Farmer Sept 25 at 11 Off Rec, 46, Cricklade st, Swindon

ADJUDICATIONS.

- BARRIS, WILLIAM, Kirkgate, Wakefield Wakefield Pet Sept 10 Ord Sept 10
 BISHOP, JOHN, Burton on Trent, Licensed Victualler Burton on Trent Pet Sept 10 Ord Sept 10
 BLEWITT, PATRICK LYONS, Barking rd, Essex, Physician High Court Pet July 31 Ord Sept 12
 CAMPBELL, SAMUEL, Liverpool, Merchant High Court Pet March 4 Ord Sept 12
 COOKE, CHARLES, Tonquay, Builder Exeter Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
 DELLA BOCCILLA, LOUISA, Kensington High Court Pet July 4 Ord Sept 12
 DENNIS, JOSEPH, Gt Grimsby, Fisherman Gt Grimsby Pet Sept 10 Ord Sept 10
 DE OLIVEIRA, BARON JACQUES, St James's st High Court Pet May 29 Ord Sept 10
 DOUGLAS, PERCY HOWARD, Kingston, Surrey Kingston, Surrey Pet Aug 15 Ord Sept 11
 GOLDING, GEORGE, Romsey, Hants, Farmer Southampton Pet Aug 17 Ord Sept 10
 HAMER, HENRY PRICE, Upper Norwood, Tutor High Court Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11
 HILL, JOHN GEORGE, and EDWARD STEPHEN ALCOCK, Pentonville, Publicans High Court Pet July 24 Ord Sept 11
 LEACHE, SAMUEL, Kirtlington, Cambridge, Dealer Cambridge Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 11
 LEITCHMAN, ALLEN, Kensington High Court Pet June 25 Ord Sept 10
 LYONS, MORRIS, Mile End High Court Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11
 MORGAN, JOHN DAVID, Tylorstown, Glam, Grocer Pontypool Pet Sept 10 Ord Sept 11

- ORLEBAR, BEAUCHAMP ORLANDO CHICHELE, Westminster Accountant High Court Pet July 3 Ord Sept 12
 OVERY, ALFRED THOMAS, Yalding, Kent, Farmer Maidstone Pet Sept 3 Ord Sept 11
 PICKUP, JAMES, Arundel st, Strand, Stockbroker High Court Pet July 7 Ord Sept 10
 PROGIN, JOSEPH FREDERICK, Longton, Staffs, Publican Stoke upon Trent Pet Sept 10 Ord Sept 10
 PRIOR, JOHN, Trebarwith, Glam, Collier Merthyr Tydfil Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
 REES, LEWIS, Tonypool, Glam, Painter Pontypool Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11

- SAUNDERS, HUGH ERIC, Esher, Surrey, Licensed Victualler Kingston, Surrey Pet July 27 Ord Sept 10
 SCALER, EDWARD, Queen Victoria st, Wm Merchant High Court Pet Aug 3 Ord Sept 12
 SHARMAN, CHARLES CHANK, Stratford, Solicitor High Court Pet July 15 Ord Sept 11
 SMITH, GEORGE ENOCH, Cinderford, Glos Gloucester Pet Sept 12 Ord Sept 12
 SMITH, JOSEPH, Penkridge, Staffs, Butcher Stafford Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
 TIMEWELL, GEORGE, and FRANK ROBERT PILDTITCH TIMEWELL, Paignton, Devon, Builders Plymouth Pet Aug 17 Ord Sept 10
 WALKER, DAVID, Stockwell, Stonemason High Court Pet Sept 10 Ord Sept 10
 WALTERS, DAVID, Ebbo Vale, Mon, Boot Dealer Tredegar Pet Sept 10 Ord Sept 11
 WILSON, WILLIAM, Whitehaven, Cumbri, Butcher Whitehaven Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11
 YULES, SIMON MENDAL, Leeds, Tailor Leeds Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 11

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

Subscription, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE, which includes Indexes, Digests, Statutes, and Postage, 52s. WEEKLY REPORTER, in wrapper, 26s.; by Post, 28s. SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 26s. 0d.; by Post, 28s. 0d. Volumes bound at the office—cloth, 2s. 9d., half law calf, 5s. 6d.

FREEHOLD GROUND-RENTS, amounting to £153 10s. per annum, secured upon 13 Residences, Nos. 80 to 96, Crouch-hill, and Nos. 15 to 22, Dickenson-road, with reversion to the rack-rents of about £1,000 per annum.—For Sale by Messrs. BEAN, BURNETT, & ELDRIDGE, 14, Nicholas-lane, E.C.

EDE AND SON,



MAKERS.

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London, &c.

ROBES FOR QUEEN'S COUNSEL AND BARRISTERS.

SOLICITORS' GOWNS.

Law Wigs and Gowns for Registrars, Town Clerks, and Clerks of the Peace.

Corporation Robes, University and Clergy Gowns.

ESTABLISHED 1696.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

MADAME TUSSAUD'S EXHIBITION.—Open at 9 a.m. during the Summer Months. Wonderful Additions. Book direct to Baker-street Station. Trains and omnibuses from all parts. Just added:—The King of Spain, Queen of Holland, &c. Richly-arranged Drawing-room Tableau. Magnificent Dresses, Superb Costumes, Costly Belles, Grand Promenade. Delightful music all day. New songs, solos, &c. Special refreshment arrangements. Popular prices. Every convenience and comfort.

MADAME TUSSAUD'S EXHIBITION.—Baker-street Station.—JABEZ SPENCER BALFOUR. THE LIBERATOR FAILURE. Open at 9 a.m. Trains and omnibuses from all parts. Admission, 1s.; children under 12, 6d. Extra rooms, 6d. MADAME TUSSAUD'S EXHIBITION.